

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 6 and 11 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16 and 20 are amended herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the thoughtful courtesies extended during the telephonic interview held on November 16, 2007. During the interview, Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed the claims and a reference entitled, "Generalized Emulation Services for Mach 3.0" ("Julin"). Applicants' representative also provided a copy of a machine translation of Japanese Patent Appl. Pub. No. 06-301555 ("Roux") and the ARRL Handbook, pp. 8-18 through 8-19 ("Handbook"). Applicants thank the Examiner for an indication that the claims would likely overcome the outstanding rejections. The amendments and remarks provided herein describe the substance of the interview and respond to the outstanding Office Action.

Applicants have enclosed a form PTO-1449, listing Roux. A copy of a machine translation of Roux is enclosed in response to the Examiner's request in the Office Action. Withdrawal of the request is hereby requested. Also enclosed herein is a copy of the Handbook.

No new matter is believed to have been introduced to the application by this amendment. The changes to the claims are fully supported by the disclosure, including, the original claims. In independent Claims 1 and 6, the term "an application server" is changed to "a remotely located application server" to clarify the invention. Independent Claim 11 has the term "a remotely located application server"; therefore, no change is made to the term. The terms "the application server" and "the remotely located application server" are replaced with the term "the

server” to provide uniformity in the claims. The specification has been amended to include the language of amended Claims 1, 6 and 11 into the summary section of the present Application in a normal sentence format.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Julin in view of the definition of Unix and further in view of Roux and European Patent Appl. Pub. No. 0597395 A1 (“Brown”). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Without surrendering any equivalents, the present invention generally concerns a method and apparatus for displaying application program information in a windowing environment. With reference to particular claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a terminal for displaying application program information in a windowing environment. The terminal comprises a processor adapted to receive windowing information supplied by application programs executing on a remotely located application server. The application programs are resident on the server. The terminal further comprises a display configured to display the windowing information supplied by the application programs executing on the server and means for simultaneously maintaining more than one connection for the application programs between the terminal and server.

Independent Claim 6 is directed to a utility for displaying application program information in a windowing environment on a terminal having a processor. The utility comprises a remotely located application server for executing application programs resident on the server and for supplying windowing information of the application programs to the terminal. The utility further comprises means for simultaneously maintaining more than one connection

for the application programs between the terminal and server. The terminal has a display configured for displaying the windowing information.

Independent Claim 11 is directed to a method for displaying application program information in a windowing environment. The method comprises the steps of receiving at a terminal windowing information supplied by application programs executing on a remotely located application server; displaying the windowing information supplied by the application programs executing on the server; and simultaneously maintaining more than one connection for the application programs between the terminal and server. The application programs are resident on the server.

Turning to the applied references, Julin—which appears to be the main reference relied upon in the Office Action—is directed to generalized emulation services for Mach 3.0. Julin discloses building emulators for various operating systems. See Julin, Abstract. Assuming, *arguendo*, the definition of emulator stated in Microsoft Computer Dictionary is applicable here, Julin at best suggests one type of computer or component to act as if it were another. In other words, Julin at best suggests a computer running on one type of operating system to act as if it were running on another type of operating system.

The Office Action states: “Julin provides for his system to function asynchronously . . . and the transparent feature (simultaneous) . . . are considered to provide proof of the simultaneous feature.” Office Action, page 4. The Office Action also anticipates that Applicants may not agree with this interpretation.

As discussed during the interview, in asynchronous communications, each character transmitted begins with a start bit and ends with a stop bit. The start bit tells the receiver to begin receiving a character. The stop bit signals the end of a character. See Handbook, p. 8-18.

As for transparency, Julin discloses, “transparently forward some invocation,” which Applicants understand to mean sending some invocation transparently to a user. Even if Julin discloses an asynchronous feature and a transparent feature of a computer, as suggested in the Office Action, it does not disclose or suggest simultaneously maintaining more than one connection for the application programs between a terminal and a remotely located application server, as recited in independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 of the present Application.

Furthermore, Julin does not disclose or suggest a terminal for receiving and displaying windowing information supplied by a plurality of application programs that are resident and executing on a remotely located application server, as recited in Claims 1, 6 and 11 of the present Application.

Roux is understood to disclose a plurality of operating systems. See Roux, Abstract. As for Brown, the Office Action states that it enables incompatible features to be translated. However, the applied references, either alone or in combination, are not understood to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent Claims 1, 6 and 11, which are believed to be in condition for allowance.

The other claims currently under consideration in the application are dependent from independent Claim 1, 6 or 11 discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner’s earliest


**No.: 09/400,733**

convenience. Applicants' undersigned attorney may be contacted at the address and telephone number set forth below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502203 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Soyeon (~~Karen~~) P. Laub  
Registration No. 39,266

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 500  
Irvine, CA 92612-7108  
Phone: 949.851.0633 SKL:sdj  
Facsimile: 949.851.9348  
**Date: November 19, 2007**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 31824  
as our correspondence address.**

ORC 427456-1.049051.0189